1	ALLISON M. BROWN (Admitted Pro Hac	Vice)
2	alli.brown@kirkland.com	
	JESSICA DAVIDSON (Admitted <i>Pro Hac V</i> jessica.davidson@kirkland.com	(ice)
3	CHRISTOPHER D. COX (Admitted Pro Ha	c Vice)
4	christopher.cox@kirkland.com KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP	
5	601 Lexington Avenue	
6	New York, NY 10022	
	Telephone: (212) 446-4800	
7	MICHAEL B. SHORTNACY (SBN: 277035	
8	mshortnacy@shb.com	
9	SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P. 2121 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400	
10	Los Angeles, CA 90067	
	Telephone: (424) 285-8330	
11	PATRICK OOT (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)	
12	oot@shb.com	
13	SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P. 1800 K St. NW Ste. 1000	
14	Washington, DC 20006	
	Telephone: (202) 783-8400	
15	Attorneys for Defendants	
16	UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;	
17	RASIER, LLC; and RASIER-CA, LLC	
18	UNITED STA	TES DISTRICT COURT
	NORTHERN DIS	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
19	SANEDA	NCISCO DIVISION
20	BAIVERA	Neisco Division
21	IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,	Case No. 3:23-md-03084-CRB
22	PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT	DECLARATION OF MICHAEL B. SHORTNACY IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS CASES FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH AMENDED PTO 10
	LITIGATION	
23		
24		
25	This Document Relates to:	Date: January 16, 2026
26	AR v. Uhar Taahnalagias Ing. et al	Time: 10:00 a.m. Courtroom: 6 – 17th Floor
27	A.B. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07699-CRB	
28		

M. SHORTNACY DECL. ISO DEFS.' MTN TO DISMISS CASES FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH AMENDED PTO 10

A.D. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07091-CRB
A.E. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.,
No. 3:25-cv-07668-CRB
A.P. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07148-CRB
C.F. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.,
No. 3:25-cv-07698-CRB
CLF T.M. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-04281-CRB
D.V. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07747-CRB
J.K.R. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07734-CRB
Jane Doe LS 618 v. Uber Technologies,
Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06160-CRB
Jane Doe LS 619 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06243-CRB
Jane Doe LS 620 v. Uber Technologies,
Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06249-CRB
Jane Doe LS 621 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06297-CRB
Jane Doe LS 622 v. Uber Technologies,
Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06306-CRB
Jane Doe LS 625 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06539-CRB
Jane Doe LS 626 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06541-CRB
Jane Doe LS 627 v. Uber Technologies,
Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06547-CRB
Jane Doe LS 628 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06552-CRB
Jane Doe LS 630 v. Uber Technologies
Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06861
Jane Doe LS 633 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07285-CRB

1	Jane Doe LS 634 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07323-CRB
2	
3	Jane Doe LS 639 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07616-CRB
4	Jane Doe LS 640 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07628-CRB
5	Jane Doe LS 641 v. Uber Technologies,
6	Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07844-CRB
7	Jane Doe LS 642 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07894-CRB
8	Jana Dan MI C (A. D.) v. Ilhan
9	Jane Doe NLG (A.D.) v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv- 07407-CRB
10	Jane Doe NLG (A.H.) v. Uber
11	Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07400-CRB
12	
13	Jane Doe NLG (D.L.) v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv- 07478-CRB
14	
15	Jane Doe NLG (J.D.) v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv- 07482-CRB
16	
17	Jane Doe NLG (J.L.) v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv- 07545-CRB
18	Jane Doe NLG (L.F.) v. Uber
19	Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07542-CRB
20	Jana Dan MIC (I. D.) v. Illian
21	Jane Doe NLG (L.R.) v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv- 07423-CRB
22	
23	Jane Doe NLG (N.T.) v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv- 07540-CRB
24	
25	Jane Doe NLG (R.H.) v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv- 07403-CRB
26	
27	Jane Doe NLG (S.M.) v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv- 07543-CRB
28	OISTS CRD

1	Jane Doe NLG (T.P.) v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-
2	07484-CRB
3	Jane Doe NLG (V.M.) v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-
4	07467-CŘB
5	Jane Doe NLG 2 (M.P.) v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-
6	07312-CRB
7	Jane Roe CL 192 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06608-CRB
8	Jane Roe CL 195 v. Uber Technologies,
9	Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06735-CRB
10	Jane Roe CL 198 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06822-CRB
11	Jane Roe CL 201 v. Uber Technologies,
12	Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06826-CRB
13	Jane Roe CL 202 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07377-CRB
14	Jane Roe CL 203 v. Uber Technologies,
15	Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07379-CRB
16	Jane Roe CL 204 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07472-CRB
17	Jane Roe CL 205 v. Uber Technologies,
18	Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07763-CRB
19	John Doe LS 15 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07862-CRB
20	
21	John Roe CL 8 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07768-CRB
22	K. H. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07700-CRB
23	M.T. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.,
24	No. 3:25-cv-07831-CRB
25	M.W. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07753-CRB
26	
27	R.N. 02 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07097-CRB

1	S.S. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07149-CRB
2 3	S.W. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-07695-CRB
4	T.K. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06734-CRB
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	M. SHORTNACY DECL. ISO DEFS.' MTN TO

Case No. 3:23-MD-3084-CRB

FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH AMENDED PTO 10

DECLARATION OF MICHAEL B. SHORTNACY

I, Michael B. Shortnacy, declare pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746:

- 1. I am over the age of 18 and am a resident of Los Angeles, California. I respectfully submit this declaration in Support of Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc.'s, Raiser LLC's, and Raiser-CA, LLC's (collectively, "Defendants") motion to dismiss the cases of certain Plaintiffs for noncompliance with Amended Pretrial Order No. 10 ("Amended PTO 10").
- 2. I am a partner at the law firm of Shook, Hardy & Bacon L.L.P., representing Defendants in this MDL. I am a member in good standing of the Bar of the State of California, the Bar of the State of New York, and the Bar of the District of Columbia. I make this declaration based upon matters within my own personal knowledge. If called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the matters set forth herein.
- 3. In March 2024, the Court entered Pretrial Order No. 10 in this matter, requiring each Plaintiff to submit a "substantially complete" PFS that "answer[ed] all applicable questions," "[i]nclude[d] a signed declaration" or verification that the PFS answers are true and correct, "provide[d] duly executed record release Authorizations," and was accompanied by a production of "the requested documents." ECF No. 348 at 6. For Plaintiffs who filed their cases before March 26, 2024, the PFS were due within sixty days. *Id.* at 5. For all other Plaintiffs, the PFS were due within 30 days of the case being filed in, removed to, or transferred to this MDL. *Id.* at 5-6.
- 4. On October 31, 2025, the parties filed a stipulation proposing amendments to PTO 10 ("Amended PTO 10"). ECF No. 4274. The Court granted the stipulation on November 3, 2025. ECF No. 4286.
- 5. Amended PTO 10 states that if a Plaintiff fails to timely and substantially comply with the Order, Uber may serve them with a "Notice of Overdue Discovery" identifying the Plaintiff's violation(s) and stating that if Plaintiff does not comply their case may be subject to dismissal. ECF No. 4274-1 at 8. If that Plaintiff then fails to cure within thirty days of service of the Notice of Overdue Discovery, Uber may move the Court for an Order dismissing the relevant Complaint without

prejudice. 1 *Id*.

2

45

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

6. The Plaintiffs listed in the attached

6. The Plaintiffs listed in the attached **Exhibit A** have, as of November 25, 2025, all failed to comply with their Amended PTO 10 obligations. The specifics of their non-compliance are detailed in Exhibit A. Uber served each of these Plaintiffs with a Notice of Overdue Discovery on a date, more than thirty days ago, listed in Exhibit A. Plaintiffs have failed to cure their non-compliance with Amended PTO 10 and thus, following the procedures specified in the Order, Uber respectfully moves the Court to dismiss Plaintiffs' complaints without prejudice.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on November 26, 2025 in Los Angeles, California.

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.

/s/ Michael B. Shortnacy____

MICHAEL B. SHORTNACY (SBN: 277035)

mshortnacy@shb.com

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.

2121 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400 Los Angeles, CA 90067

Telephone: (424) 285-8330 Facsimile: (424) 204-9093

Attorney for Defendants
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER,

LLC, and RASIER-CA, LLC

¹ Amended PTO 10 also requires the Parties to meet and confer regarding any PFS deficiencies prior to Uber moving the Court for a dismissal without prejudice based on such deficiencies. However, this Motion only pertains to Plaintiffs that have failed to submit a PFS altogether (as opposed to submitting anything that Uber argues is deficient) and therefore this PTO provision is not applicable here and no conferral is required.